

**THE PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD
INTERNATIONAL UNION, UAW**

APPEAL OF:

EVE M. THIELEN, RECORDING SECRETARY
LOCAL UNION 72, UAW,
(Kenosha, Wisconsin),
Appellant

-vs-

CASE NO. 1479

LOCAL UNION 72, UAW EXECUTIVE BOARD
REGION 4
(THE UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE
AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT
WORKERS OF AMERICA),
Appellee.

DECISION

(Issued October 25, 2004)

PANEL SITTING: Prof. Theodore J. St. Antoine, Chairperson,
Prof. Benjamin Aaron, Prof. Janice R. Bellace,
Prof. James J. Brudney, Prof. James E. Jones,
Jr., and Prof. Paul Weiler.

We consider whether a procedure adopted by the UAW Local 72 Press Committee for reviewing articles submitted for publication in the Local's newspaper was inconsistent with the UAW Constitution or the Local Union's Bylaws, or if the procedure was applied in a manner that denied Eve Thielen rights guaranteed to her under the Constitution.

FACTS

Eve Thielen is the Recording Secretary of UAW Local 72 in Kenosha, Wisconsin. As Recording Secretary, Thielen is also a member of the Local 72 Press Committee in accordance with Article 11, §10, of the Local Union Bylaws.¹ Thielen regularly submitted

¹ Article 11, §10, of the Local Union Bylaws provides as follows:

"The top four (4) officers and the Shop Chairman shall constitute the Press Committee of this Union.

No news release, of any nature, vital to the interests of the Union, shall be made by anyone except with the approval of the Press Committee.

articles to the Local's newspaper, *The Labor Paper*, under the byline, "For the Record...A Message from Eve Thielen, Local 72 Recording Secretary."² *The Labor Paper* also published articles by Shop Committee Chairperson Curt Wilson as "Curt's Comments" and Vice President Phil Anastasi as "Vice President's Corner."³

On June 10, 2003, Local 72 President John Drew called a meeting of the Press Committee to discuss policies regarding press releases and articles. As Recording Secretary, Thielen took notes at the meeting and transcribed them as meeting minutes.⁴ According to the meeting minutes, President Drew informed the Press Committee that he had called the meeting to discuss the last column that Thielen had published in *The Labor Paper*. President Drew is reported to have informed Thielen that her newspaper articles dealt with matters unrelated to her office as Recording Secretary.⁵

Thielen responded that she used her article to communicate with the membership and the retirees. After some discussion of Thielen's article, the minutes reflect that the following exchange occurred:

"JD: I suggest we follow the bylaws from now on. I'll look at your article and decide what needs to be taken out. Then I will bring it to the Press Committee.

ET: That is censorship and discrimination. What does the bylaw say exactly?

JD: (Read the bylaw that speaks of the Press Committee.)

ET: The bylaw says that all releases go before the Press Committee. I'm on the Press Committee. When Phil and Curt start sending me their articles before they go in the paper, I'll start sending you mine.

The Press Committee may review and approve all press releases with the exception of those made by the Local President which may not come under the jurisdiction of this language."

² Record, Volume 1, pp. 102-103.

³ Record, Volume 1, pp. 1-22.

⁴ Record, Volume 1, pp. 23-30, 33-38.

⁵ According to the minutes, President Drew stated:

"You have stuff about the retirees. Congratulations to the chief stewards. We have never had an installation of the chief stewards. You talk about CAP ticket sales. That is not your place. You have ramblings of history of the UAW with the New Directions movement.

Then you bring up the website committee. And this is just this month. This is all self-promoting you with the membership. ..." (Record, Volume 1, p. 33)

(Long Pause)

JD: No, I will look at your article and if I find anything I don't like I will bring it to the Press Committee."⁶

A vote was taken and President Drew's motion passed. The motion is stated in the minutes as follows:

"The motion was carried to have Eve send her labor paper articles to John Drew for review before printing and if there is something John doesn't like he will bring it to the Press Committee for a vote."⁷

Thielen appealed the Press Committee's decision to the Local Union on June 13, 2003. In support of her appeal, Thielen stated that the action of the Press Committee was discriminatory, denied her due process, and amounted to improper censorship. She pointed out that the Vice President and the Shop Chairperson consistently publish material unrelated to their duties as officers. She stated that the motion passed by the Press Committee only applied to her. Thielen wrote:

"As a member of the Press Committee, I am not being given the opportunity to review or approve publications of the same nature published by others before printing. I believe this to be in violation of the named bylaw and an act of discrimination and censorship directed toward me and to my article all in an effort to stifle and suppress my views and opinions and attempt to isolate me from the members and retirees I represent."⁸

Thielen went on to say that the bylaw establishing the Press Committee already addresses the method of reviewing articles for publication, so that the Press Committee's action amounted to an attempt to amend the bylaws without approval from the International President's office as is required by the Constitution. As a remedy, Thielen asked that the Press Committee's motion be rescinded and that the Recording Secretary be treated as an equal. She stated:

"...Allow the Recording Secretary to freely express views and opinions that may or may not necessarily relate to the Recording Secretary's specific job duties as all others who

⁶ Record, Volume 1, p. 36.

⁷ Record, Volume 1, p. 37.

⁸ Record, Volume 1, p. 42.

publish articles in the *Kenosha Labor Paper* and elsewhere are.”⁹

Thielen argued that if articles are to be reviewed by the Press Committee, one standard should be applied to everyone.

On June 17, 2003, President Drew, Vice President Anastasi, Shop Committee Chair Curt Wilson and Financial Secretary Bob Rosinski drafted the following memorandum:

“Article 11, Section 10 of the Local 72 By-Laws designates the four (4) top officers and the Shop Chairman as the members of the Press Committee. On June 10, 2003, the Press Committee met at the request of the President and adopted the following procedure:

All articles for publication will first be submitted to the President for review. If the President feels any article needs further review he will bring it to the entire Press Committee.

No article will be edited by the President without the approval of the Press Committee.”¹⁰

When Thielen’s appeal came before the Local 72 Executive Board on June 18 President Drew read the memorandum that Anastasi, Rosinski, Wilson and he had drafted on June 17. During the discussion of the appeal, President Drew stated that the motion adopted by the Press Committee on June 10 applied to all articles submitted for publication in the Local Union’s newspaper.¹¹ Thielen insisted that the motion adopted at the Press Committee meeting only applied to her articles.¹² After an argument about what took place at the June 10 Press Committee meeting, Thielen stated:

⁹ Record, Volume 1, p. 43.

¹⁰ Record, Volume 1, p. 46

¹¹ Drew stated:

“We were all there, the motion was made to adopt the procedure and the procedure was to let the President read all the articles and if there was something I felt was not in the interest of the union to be printed that I would get the whole Press Committee together to review it. Otherwise the articles would run. And that applies to everybody. Applies to Curt, applies to Phil, applies to the Recording Secretary. Everybody else that has ever written articles has always submitted them to the President first. ...” (Record, Volume 1, p. 50)

¹² Thielen stated:

“...That motion was made specifically for my article. It was not made for anybody else’s article even when I brought it up about other people who put articles in the paper with issues that don’t involve their direct job responsibilities, I was told by the Shop Chairman,

“I don’t have an objection to everyone’s articles being reviewed, but I have an objection to the standards being different. I have a stack of articles at home from everyone else who puts them in *The Labor Paper*. And the distinct argument at the meeting was that my discussion in my article isn’t related to my specific job duties as a Recording Secretary. Well, I have stacks of articles from the Shop Chair and the Vice President that are personal issues, golf issues, endorsement for bank issues, and everything else, but that’s never been brought up and it never was spoke of in the meeting and it’s suddenly an issue with my article.
...”¹³

Thielen’s appeal was submitted to a vote and a motion to deny the appeal was supported by a vote of 8 to 3.¹⁴

Thielen appealed the Local Executive Board’s denial of her appeal to the International Executive Board (IEB) on June 30, 2003. In her appeal, Thielen maintained that the document adopted by the four other members of the Press Committee on June 17 did not accurately reflect the motion passed at the Press Committee meeting on June 10. She also pointed out that the articles published by Vice President Anastasi and Shop Chairperson Wilson often dealt with issues unrelated to their offices.¹⁵ Thielen reported that no articles had been presented to her for review as a member of the Press Committee.¹⁶ Finally, Thielen argued that the reviewing

‘This isn’t about my article. This is about your article.’ This was not a discussion about everybody’s article. It was about Eve’s article. ...” (Record, Volume 1, p. 51)

¹³ Record, Volume 1, p. 52.

¹⁴ Record, Volume 1, p. 53.

¹⁵ Thielen wrote:

“...The June 27, 2003, publications by C. Wilson and P. Anastasi in the *Kenosha Labor Paper* included information that did not have anything to do with the job duties of the Vice President or Shop Committee Chair. In fact, both of them pick and choose who they will and won’t give condolences to and who to congratulate for having grandchildren etc. There is no system that notifies them of everyone who has a death in the family or who has a grandchild. It becomes hit and miss and unfair to all the members. Not to mention, even when they are aware of these circumstances, they don’t acknowledge the people they don’t like. If these articles went through J. Drew, then there is clearly a double standard as to sticking to what direct job duties as an officer. ...” (Record, Volume 1, p. 56)

¹⁶ Record, Volume 1, p. 57

method adopted by the Press Committee violated the language of Article 11, §10, of the Local Union Bylaws.¹⁷

Thielen stated that she had not complied with the directive of the Press Committee; that is, she had not submitted any articles for publication in *The Labor Paper*. She asked the International Union to waive compliance with the newly adopted review procedure pending resolution of her appeal.¹⁸

In response to Thielen's appeal, President Drew maintained that since the Press Committee adopted the resolution on June 10, the Vice President and the Shop Chairperson had submitted their articles to him for review. He submitted copies of the approved articles. Drew reported that Thielen had not submitted any articles for publication since the procedure was adopted.¹⁹

The International President's staff determined that a hearing was unnecessary on Thielen's appeal and prepared a report on behalf of the International President for the IEB based on the information provided by Thielen and the Local Union. In the report, the staff acknowledged that Thielen and the other Press Committee members disagreed about what took place at the meeting on June 10, but it concluded that the procedure presented to the Local Executive Board on June 18 was the procedure that the Local intended to follow in the future.²⁰ This policy, the staff wrote, was not in conflict with the Local Union Bylaws, nor did it treat Thielen differently from the other Executive Board members with regard to the review of articles submitted to the *Labor Paper*. Consequently, the staff found no reason to set the policy aside. The President's staff denied Thielen's appeal, and its decision was adopted by the IEB.²¹ The IEB notified Thielen of its decision on March 8, 2004, and she appealed to the Public Review Board (PRB), on March 16.

¹⁷ Thielen wrote:

"I do not believe it is right for the committee to take action that circumvents the original Bylaw without approval from the International President's office or by changing the Bylaw. In summary, the Committee has taken action to achieve unequal censorship, suppression, stifling and evident discrimination based [on] my gender and age accompanied by other political motives." (Record, Volume 1, p. 58)

¹⁸ Record, Volumes 1, p. 54. Thielen explained this decision in her subsequent appeal to the PRB as follows:

"...I have been unwilling to submit an article for printing in the Kenosha labor paper to the President because I have difficulty dealing with the fact that I would be spending hours writing an article on Sunday night only to have the President of our local chop it to pieces on Monday morning using discriminatory and unequal standards. I will concede and press myself to comply at this point." (Record, Volume 1, p. 86)

¹⁹ Record, Volume 1, p. 59.

²⁰ Record, Volume 1, p. 84.

²¹ Record, Volume 1, pp. 79, 85.

While her appeal was pending before the PRB, on April 26, 2004, Thielen submitted an article for publication in the *Kenosha Labor Paper* to President Drew for review.²² The following day, Drew sent Thielen an email recommending changes to the article. He asked that Thielen remove a sentence commenting on the absence of her column in the paper. He suggested that Thielen should get the approval of the Retirees' Board member before publishing a description of a "Baseball Tailgate Party" sponsored by the Retirees' Recreation Committee. He asked her to remove a paragraph describing procedures for requesting leave in order to attend a membership meeting, and a paragraph in which she offered her services as a Notary.²³ Thielen replied to Drew by email that she did not approve of the proposed changes and wished to bring the matter before the Press Committee for review.²⁴ The Press Committee met to review Thielen's article and Drew's suggestions on April 27. The minutes reflect that the Press Committee voted to approve Drew's recommendations as reflected in his email to Thielen.²⁵

ARGUMENT

A. Eve Thielen:

The events at the June 10, 2003, meeting are accurately described in the minutes I prepared. President Drew criticized me for reporting that the newly elected chief stewards would be sworn in at the September membership meeting. The President said that we have never had an installation of chief stewards. I asked one of the chief stewards about this. I thought perhaps the installation occurred in some setting other than a membership meeting. I was informed that there is no installation ceremony for stewards at our Local. The individuals responsible for handling every single grievance from our membership ought to take an oath of office. Article 45, §2, of the Constitution requires them to take an oath of office. My point is that the officers of Local 72 consistently refuse to acknowledge and adhere to the laws of the Union including the Constitution and Local Union Bylaws. They have no fear of repercussions because they have been permitted to get away with these types of actions for so very long by conducting the business of the Local behind closed doors.

In the case of my articles for the Local paper, the President, Vice President, Shop Chairman and Financial Secretary united in their efforts to intimidate and silence me by holding a Press Committee meeting behind closed doors and lying about their actions. They altered the way the bylaws are applied in a manner inconsistent with the way they are written. These procedures were adopted without informing the membership about the issues.

²² Record, Volume 1, p. 105

²³ Record, Volume 1, pp. 115, 120-121.

²⁴ Record, Volume 1, p. 115.

²⁵ Record, Volume 1, p. 119.

Never in one-hundred years would the chauvinistic Shop Chairman or Vice President adhere to the bylaw the way it is written and consent to allowing a woman, especially this one, to review their articles before publication. I would have no problem with reviewing everyone's articles as part of my responsibilities as a Press Committee member. If this system does not work, however, the procedure is to present a bylaw change to the membership that is efficient and reflects the reality of the situation. Then the membership will have the opportunity to hear the issues and vote on the change democratically. The reason this was not done is that it would force these men to explain themselves and would bring their obvious malice and double standards out from behind the closed doors for all to see.

B. International Union, UAW:

The adoption of a formal procedure for reviewing articles submitted to a local union newspaper is entirely consistent with Article 29, §7, of the International Constitution, which governs such publications.²⁶ The Recording Secretary of a local union has no special status in regard to submitting articles for publication in a local union's newspaper. The PRB has ruled that "a member possesses no right to insist that a local's newspaper publish his views on subjects he believes to be important for consideration by his union brothers and sisters." *Plyer v. Local 599, UAW*, 1 PRB 238 (1961); *Yettaw v. Local 599, UAW*, PRB Case No. 1378 (2002).

The decision of the IEB did not include a review of articles submitted for publication after the policy was adopted by the Press Committee. However, it is apparent from the materials that were submitted by Thielen on May 25, 2004, that any member can use the policy to challenge editorial recommendations made by the President. What appellant here is appealing is the possibility of future harm. The perceived injury is speculative and potential; there has been no showing that the new review system is flawed.

The issue before the IEB was the decision by the Local Executive Board to approve the procedure for reviewing submissions to the Local's newspaper adopted by the Press Committee on June 10, 2003. Thielen's argument concerning unequal treatment involves articles that were published prior June 10, 2003. What may have been permitted prior to June 10, 2003, is irrelevant to this appeal. The Press Committee, including the appellant, has acknowledged that articles submitted to the paper by Press Committee members have not been reviewed in the past.

²⁶ Article 29, §7, states, in pertinent part, as follows:

"Local publications shall conform with the policies of the International Union and all Local Union Editors and/or Editorial Committees shall be responsible to the Officers and Executive Board of the Local Union who shall have authority to effectuate such conformity..."

C. Rebuttal by Eve Thielen:

In response to my appeal, certain members of the Press Committee held a private meeting to which I was not invited. The document signed by those members at this meeting is contrary to the proceedings of the meeting on June 10, 2003. That document, dated June 17, 2003, is not an official record of the Local Union. It is a complete fabrication, yet this is what the Local Executive Board's decision is based on. I was not even aware of this document until it was presented at the Local Executive Board meeting on June 18, 2003.

Furthermore, the policy that was adopted is not being applied fairly. The articles that I have submitted for publication in the Local Union newspaper were scrutinized and censored, while articles submitted by the other members of the Local's Executive Board were published, even when they contained matters unrelated to the author's office. A review of the articles submitted after the policy was adopted shows that some of the articles submitted by the other Executive Board members were approved by the President after the paper went to print. The Union did not even present any drafts of articles submitted by these other members until after August 15, 2003.

The President did not allow me to mention my services as a Notary, because this is not a service provided by Local 72. At the same time, he allowed the Shop Chairperson to publish personal recommendations of the Bank of Elmwood. Other Press Committee members, all male, are entitled to make personal remarks and comment on matters unrelated to their offices. The Local Union President never called a Press Committee meeting to discuss any of the male officer's press releases; he has called two Press Committee meetings to discuss mine.

The IEB argued that the procedure adopted by the Press Committee was consistent with Article 29, §7, of the Constitution. This statement overlooks the fact that our Bylaws already had a procedure for reviewing articles for publication in the Local Union newspaper. The new procedure adopted by the Press Committee on June 17 was inconsistent with the previously existing Bylaw. It amounted to an attempt to amend the Bylaws without following the prescribed method.

I have not claimed, as suggested by the International Union, that I have a right to have my articles published in the Local Union newspaper. I did not refuse to submit my article for review under any previously established dispute resolution procedure. My argument is that my articles are being scrutinized and unequally censored for discriminatory and retaliatory reasons. The June 10, 2003, Press Committee meeting was a direct consequence and retribution for my having filed an appeal challenging the way the full-time elected officers schedule vacation. That appeal has been docketed by the PRB as Case No. 1481.

DISCUSSION

We agree with the finding of the IEB that the policy drafted by President Drew, Vice President Anastasi, Financial Secretary Rosinski and Shop Chairperson Wilson on June 17, 2003, and presented to the Local 72 Executive Board on June 18, during the discussion of Thielen's appeal, was the official policy adopted by the Local for resolving conflicts over what should appear in the Local Union's newspaper. Our agreement with the IEB on this point does not require a conclusion that the minutes Recording Secretary Thielen took during the meeting on June 10, 2003, were inaccurate. Thielen's minutes reflect an angry discussion directed exclusively at the article she had published on May 30, 2003. President Drew is reported to have said that in the future he would review Thielen's articles and decide what needed to be taken out. Such a policy, directed solely against one individual, would clearly have been inappropriate. When it came time to draft a provision for presentation to the entire Executive Board, however, Drew eliminated any individual references.

The procedure that was adopted is consistent with Article 11, §10, of the Local Union's Bylaws. That section clearly gives the Local President initial editorial control over what shall appear in the newspaper. Moreover, his articles are specifically exempted from review by the Press Committee. Under the Bylaws, the Press Committee is granted the authority to review all press releases other than those of the Local President. The policy that President Drew presented to the Local Executive Board simply sets in place a mechanism to trigger Press Committee review whenever disputes arise regarding editorial matters. The President always had the authority to make editorial decisions regarding what should appear in the Local paper.

The procedure adopted by Local 72 is also consistent with Article 29, §7, of the International Constitution, which requires local unions to put in place some system of editorial control over what appears in local publications. As noted by the International Union, we have held that no member has the right to insist that his views should appear in the Local Union's newspaper. Even where such right exists by virtue of the member's office, we have held that right is subject to the editorial policies adopted by the Local in carrying out its duty under Article 29, §7. *Bier v. Local Union 2500 Executive Board, UAW*, 5 PRB 805, (1990). We have also ruled, however, that editorial policies adopted by local unions must be equally applied. *Yettaw v. Local Union 599, UAW*, 6 PRB 236, (1992); *Noall, vs. Local Union 599, UAW*, PRB Case No. 1261, (1999). In *Yettaw*, we stated:

“The first principle which we believe must guide those responsible for editing for policy conformity is equality of treatment. If an editor insists that the submissions of those officials entitled to signed columns must conform to union policy, then all such submissions should be subject to the

same standards. It is improper to insist that some conform while exempting others. ...²⁷

Thielen has argued that Local 72's editorial policies are being applied unequally. She asserts that her articles are being singled out for scrutiny for discriminatory and retaliatory reasons. We initially considered Thielen's appeal on June 19, 2004. In order to evaluate her claim that the editorial policy adopted by the Press Committee was not being applied fairly, we requested that the Local submit copies of all the articles submitted by the Local Executive Board members as they were submitted, and as they appeared in the newspaper after the policy was adopted.

The materials submitted by Local 72 do not support a conclusion that its editorial policies are being applied unequally. There is little basis for forming such a conclusion because Thielen submitted only two articles to the *Labor Paper* during the relevant period. Among the articles submitted by the Local Union is the article Thielen submitted on April 26, 2004, with President Drew's comments, and the article as it ultimately appeared in *The Labor Paper*.²⁸ Thielen submitted an article on May 28, 2004, and that appears to have been published without any changes.²⁹ It is true that Chairperson Curt Wilson was permitted to publish an endorsement of the Bank of Elmwood in the *Labor Paper* on August 29, 2003, in violation of the International Union's policy against the endorsement of outside businesses by Local Unions as stated in President Ron Gettelfinger's Administrative Letter dated November 21, 2003, while Thielen was criticized for informing the membership that she was a Notary. Thielen submitted a copy of Wilson's August 29, 2003, article and Gettelfinger's Administrative Letter in support of her claim that she was being treated unfairly.³⁰ Wilson's article is among the articles submitted by the Local in response to our request.³¹ The President probably ought not to have allowed this endorsement to run, but this one instance does not establish a pattern of discrimination.

In her comments on the Local's submission, Thielen argues that her articles are more closely scrutinized than those submitted by the Shop Chairperson or the Vice President, and that does seem to be the case. This is not a circumstance, however, for which we can provide any abstract, anticipatory remedy. Challenges to the unequal application of policies must follow the procedure adopted by the Local for resolving editorial disputes, and subsequent Constitutional levels of appeal. In *Noall*, cited previously, we pointed out that the PRB cannot substitute its judgment for decisions made by the person responsible for editing local union publications, but we noted that the appeal process provides a check on the editor's authority.³² In *Yettaw*, we rejected

²⁷ 6 PRB 236, at 240.

²⁸ Record, Volume 2, pp. 168-173.

²⁹ Record, Volume 2, pp. 192-195.

³⁰ Record, Volume 1, pp. 34-35.

³¹ Record, Volume 2, pp. 76-78.

³² PRB Case No. 1261, at p. 8.

a challenge to an editor's refusal to print an article in the Local Union's newspaper because the appellant had failed to use the procedure adopted by the Local for resolving editorial disputes.³³

Thielen has argued that she is excluded from meaningful participation in decisions of the Press Committee, because she is a woman and the other members are male. The record demonstrates, however, that political differences, rather than gender discrimination, account for the fact that Thielen has not been called upon to review any of the other officer's submissions.³⁴ Under the procedure adopted by the Local, Press Committee review is triggered only when there is a dispute about an editorial decision made by the Local Union President. Articles submitted by the other Local Union officers have not been brought before the Press Committee for review, because there were no editorial disputes to resolve in connection with these articles. Notwithstanding the published bank endorsement referred to earlier, this record does not reveal a pattern of inconsistent or unequal application of editorial policy.

To be sure, the President is less likely to find fault with articles submitted by his political allies than with those submitted by a member who has been openly critical of the local administration's policies and procedures. Such consequences of political alliances are simply a fact of local union life, and do not by themselves violate the member's rights under the International Constitution. We specifically rejected such a claim in *Plyer*. That decision states:

“...Complainant does not allege that either the International Union or the local attempted to prevent him from giving expression to his views. ...His sole complaint is that his articles were rejected by the local union publication for what he considers to have been an invalid reason. What has been denied him, then, is not the right to publish his political opinions, but the alleged right to have them published by his

³³ PRB Case No. 1378, (2002).

³⁴ In support of her claim that she was being discriminated against on the basis of her gender, Thielen reported the following encounters with Financial Secretary Rosinski and Shop Chairperson Wilson:

“This example of gender discrimination from another Press Committee member was previously referenced pertaining to a confidential altercation that took place on April 27, 2004, between the male Financial Secretary and myself where as the FST proceeded to call me a “tramp,” a “whore” and a “fucking whore” over and over in a loud abusive, threatening manner over a seniority roster issue. This is an example of the discriminatory, gender-related frame of mind exhibited by this Press Committee member.” (Record, Volume 1, p. 145)

* * *

“...the Shop Chairman, who is also a Press Committee member, refuses to acknowledge me as the liaison board member for the Election Committee because I am a female, but will gladly communicate with the male Election Committee chair. ...” (Record, Volume 1, p. 146)

local union. This distinction is fundamental and dispositive of the issues here.³⁵

We find that the procedure adopted by the Local 72 Executive Board was consistent with the Local Union Bylaws and the International Constitution. That procedure plus the appeals processes described in the Constitution provide Thielen with an adequate means to challenge editorial decisions which she believes are unfair.

The decision of the International Executive Board is affirmed.

³⁵ 1 PRB 238, at 242.